

*Draft Minutes*  
**Franks Tract, Delta Cross Channel, and Through Delta Facility  
(FTDCCTDF)  
Project Team**

**June 9, 2005 meeting, 1:30-4:00, 650 Capital Mall, Sacramento, CBDA Delta Room**

**Attendees**

Bruce Herbold.....	EPA
Tina Swanson.....	Bay Institute
Bruce Oppenheim .....	NMFS
Don Kurosaka, Dan Fua, Sean Bagheban.....	DWR
Roger Churchwell, David Martasian .....	DWR
Pat Coulston, Bob Fujimura.....	DFG
Sharon McHale .....	USBR
Paul Cadrett.....	USFWS
Jon Burau .....	USGS
Gita Kapahi .....	SWRCB
Dennis Majors, Lynda Smith .....	MWDSC
Joe Miyamoto.....	EBMUD
Samantha Salvia.....	CCWD
Lev Kavvas, Ayako Kawabata, ZhiQiang Chen.....	UC Davis
Dennis Cocherell, Emily Anderson .....	UC Davis
Claire Tomkins.....	Stanford
Ron Ott, Darryl Hayes, Lisa Holm .....	CBDA
Rhonda Reed, Lauren Hastings, Patricia Fernandez.....	CBDA

**Agenda:**

1. Welcome – Ron Ott
  - Purpose of the Team
  - Summary of last meetings
2. Status of the DCC Studies – Dan Fua
3. Status of the TDF Studies – Sean Bagheban
  - Sturgeon Passage Studies – Roger Churchwell/Lev Kavvas
  - Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel – Roger Churchwell
4. Status of Franks Tract Studies – Dan Fua / Don Kurosaka
5. Action Items and Next Meeting – Ron Ott

**1. Purpose of Team and Summary of last meetings– Ron Ott**

The DCCTDF Team has not met for over a year. Since that time, there has been a shift of work on Franks Tract with many of the same water quality objectives and as the TDF. Due to this, both projects will be coordinated in this team. The new team name is: FTDCCTDF Team (Franks Tract, Delta Cross Channel, and Through Delta Facility Team).

DWR is the lead agency for the Franks Tract work and TDF while the USBR has been identified as the lead agency for the DCC Re-operation study. The CALFED Delta Improvements Package developed over the past year with stakeholders and agencies said that both these efforts must proceed in parallel.

#### *Summary of last meetings*

At the last meeting (Jan. 2004), the Team was working on refocusing the “22 questions” to determine if there was enough information to address the questions, or if they could be reasonably addressed. The notes from that meeting were handed out.

#### **Action Items:**

- *Darryl Hayes will work with CBDA to develop a website for the Team. The new site will be posted on the CBDA site under the Conveyance Program area. Darryl will post meeting minutes, handouts, and relevant FTDCCTDF documents as they are developed*
- <http://calwater.ca.gov/Programs/Conveyance/FTDDCCTDF/DCCTDF.shtml>
- *The Team should review the 22 questions and determine if they still make sense and who should be responsible for work.*

## **2. DCC Studies – Dan Fua**

Dan Fuam briefly described the progress on the efforts on the DCC. DWR, with USGS and others, is working on a pilot effort to expand the previous DCC studies. A science based study in Fall 2006 will look at both water quality and fisheries impacts of DCC gate closures on adjacent channels. This future regional study will be a major effort. Jon Burau described the flow studies and stations they are working on.

#### **Action Items:**

- *Draft reports from previous work will be circulated to the Team as they are developed. This work will form the basis for future DCC and regional studies.*
- *Pilot fisheries studies and flow station installation will continue and form the basis for a science reviewed effort.*

## **3. DCCTDF Overview – Sean Bagheban**

Sean handed out a summary of the study history, objectives, and progress. Technical studies on several fish passage issues have continued during the past year.

#### *Discussion:*

- DWR has funded most of the DCC studies to date, despite that the USBR is the lead agency. Most of the work to date has been conducted by USGS;
- What is water quality being driven by, Fish or Exports? It seems like no water quality objectives have been established for this project and that this should

have been done first. What are the projects being judged against? The CBDA Water Quality program is trying to take this on now;

- The Team was going to look at common assumptions to establish this, but the modeling has been behind in helping on what can be done;
- Over the past year, many new stations are being developed and established in the Central Delta. Franks Tract mixing is complicated and requires many new stations to understand and to calibrate the model to see what can be done.
- Has there been any progress on integrating Delta projects? MWD did set up an integration meeting effort, but it essentially fell apart due to lack of management support. The DIP may try to take this up this coordination in the future;
- New modeling tools are being investigated. RMA-2 is currently be calibrated for Franks and then on to do the North Delta area.
- Some feel that Franks Tract project may preclude the need for a TDF, but until standards are set, this is uncertain. How good can we do with the projects is the goal now.
- We should determine the contribution of the water quality improvements by project;
- How are San Joaquin Flow issues being incorporated into this project? They are but not in this Team. The DIP is looking at this overall.
- DWR has been working on identifying fatal flaws on the passage issues;
- Water Quality is more than just salinity. We need to get these objectives resolved – the Team has never had this resolved;
- We could look at salinity concentration as a metric;
- Water Quality standards are most difficult to meet in the fall and early winter. We should develop projects to improve this period;
- Performance measures are definitely needed;
- Prop. 13 funds targeted on developing and constructing Fish Facilities are being used for most of the DCCTDF studies. This is why more work is being done on this area – the funding is not that flexible and is being scrutinized.
- The funding for Franks Tract may be a combination of State Water Contractor funding and some from USBR.
- There was concern that there has NOT been enough oversight on the studies.

**Action Items:**

- *Lisa Holm will work on developing Performance Measures to help guide this effort.*
- *Ron Ott and CBDA Management Team will provide oversight for projects being conducted for this effort. Ron will bring issues to Management as appropriate.*

**3b. Fish Passage Studies – Roger Churchwell**

*Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel Study*

This study looked at using a lock as a passage option to see if fish could be attracted into it and successfully pass. This study is completed, but the data is still being analyzed and the report must be finalized. The final report should be available in November 2005.

*Discussion:*

- Some people did not understand how this project would be used in developing a fish passage facility. Roger said that additional studies on attraction are really needed.
- The proposed work on passage animation might be interesting, but its value was questioned.

**Action Item:**

- ***Roger will prepare a draft report for review by the FTDCCTDF Team before being finalized. The schedule should allow final by the November 2005 date set.***

***Yolo Toe Drain Study***

Roger C. said that this work has been problematic since the start of the project due to issues and flows in the drain. The facility has never performed as intended and the study never went beyond some pilot testing. Roger asked the group what should be done with the effort.

*Discussion:*

- Due to the downstream Lisbon Weir, all fish must be hauled over the barrier to be investigated. In addition, the project is far from being able to look at attraction flows.
- This effort is very premature due to all the other outstanding issues on the DCCTDF so it should be stopped.
- It was unclear how we will use these results.

**Action Item:**

- ***The Team was NOT supportive of continuing this effort. DWR will stop all research work on this project and work on removing the barrier.***

***Sturgeon Passage Lab Study***

Roger presented a PowerPoint on this effort. It is available on the website. The project is set up at UC Davis and is running large wild white sturgeon in a 4% sloped flume through several baffled pools. While some designs have been used with some passage success, the pilot efforts have NOT looked at swimming performance efforts or other issues. Interesting behaviors of passage have been reported and passage success has been around 50% for grade changes of several feet in height. An additional two years and \$1-2 million might be needed to complete studies.

*Discussion:*

- Many are encouraged by results but not sure if this can be scaled up and used for a TDF or DCC installation;
- It would be good to understand attraction issues as well as passage issues;
- Write-ups of completed studies are needed before too much judgement can be given or before heading into a new plan;
- This study might have broad application. Other funding sources might wish to participate rather than just this project since the cost is very high;
- Can the facility be built to look at attraction at ladder entrance?
- Is this project cost effective? Are ladders at a TDF the only option?

**Action Item:**

- *Roger will work with UC Davis to complete write-up on efforts to date. No new efforts will be recommended until this work is reviewed and a science based proposal is written and justified.*

**4. Status of Franks Tract Studies – Dan Fua**

Dan Fua did not have sufficient time to present progress due to meeting time constraints.

*Discussion:*

- These studies are dragging on too long. Decisions were to be made in 2003...now it appears to be 2008!
- The relationship to decisions on Franks Tract and other issues is unclear?
- The SWC may fund FT if no State money in budget. However, the SWC are NOT interested in seeing a barrier as part of the project. They would like to see a pilot project developed is much simpler and less controversial.

**Action Item:**

- *Franks Tract progress will be taken up at the next meeting. A FT public meeting will be held in Bethel Island in the middle of June (this is an ERP funded project effort). All interested Team members are invited to attend.*

**5. Next Meeting**

Meetings will be held as necessary and will be scheduled once monthly subject to change. The second Tuesday of each month was identified as the best time for a meeting.

**Action Item:**

- *The next meeting date will Thursday, July 21 from 1:30 – 4:30, CBDA Delta Room. See the website for future meeting dates.*